

**Report**

C|A|S|I|N

# Davos 2008 Report

From “Act Together for Another World” to “The Power of Collaborative Innovation”

**February 2008**

Isabelle Hildebrand  
Geneva, Switzerland

**Programme on NGOs & Civil Society**

Centre for Applied Studies in International Negotiations  
Centre d'études pratiques de la négociation internationale

C | A | S | I | N

**Centre for Applied Studies in  
International Negotiations**

C.P. 1340  
Av. de la Paix 7 bis  
1211 Geneva 1  
Switzerland

T +41 22 730 8675/76  
F +41 22 730 8690  
ngocasin@casin.ch  
www.casin.ch

**Isabelle Hildebrand**, Event, Communication & Research Officer, prepared this report for the Programme on NGOs and Civil Society of the Centre for Applied Studies in International Negotiation.

**The Programme on NGOs and Civil Society**

Worldwide, the role of civil society has been increasing at rapid speed. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have become significant and influential players and generate much interest. Created in 1986, the Programme on Non-Governmental Organizations and Civil Society aims at contributing towards a better understanding of NGOs and the solutions of complex and conflictive societal problems involving NGOs.

The opinions expressed in this paper reflect only those of the author and not of the institutions to which she is or was affiliated.

Copyright CASIN © February 2008



# Table of Contents

DAVOS 2008 REPORT .....	1
THE PUBLIC EYE AWARDS : DAVOS, JANUARY 23, 2008.....	1
<b>Introducing the event</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Awards &amp; Winners: “Global players, Watch out, we are watching you!”</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>The Public Eye Global Award</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>The Public Eye Swiss Award</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>The Public Eye Positive Award</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>The Public Eye People’s Award</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Audience and Atmosphere</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Concluding remarks</b> .....	<b>4</b>
THE OPEN FORUM – DAVOS, JANUARY 24–26, 2008.....	5
<b>Introducing the event</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>“The Comeback of Religion – A Potential Danger for the Secular State?”</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>“Private Equity and Hedge Funds – Friend or Foe?”</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>“USA: What Next after the Elections?” &amp; “What are Russia’s geopolitical ambitions?”</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>“Do We Need Economic Growth to Achieve More Sustainability?”</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>“Climate Change Divide”</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>“Virtual Worlds – Fiction or Reality?”</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>Concluding remarks</b> .....	<b>13</b>
PROTESTS, WORLD SOCIAL FORUM & CIVIL SOCIETY .....	14
<b>Protests</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>The World Social Forum: “Act Locally, Think Globally”</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Civil Society</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Concluding remarks: Is the WEF shifting to “creative capitalism”?</b> .....	<b>15</b>
SOURCES : ARTICLES & PRESS RELEASES .....	17
<b>Articles</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Websites</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Others</b> .....	<b>18</b>
ANNEX 1 : OPEN FORUM 2008 PROGRAMME .....	I
OPEN FORUM 2008 PROGRAMME .....	I
<b>1. The Comeback of Religion – A Potential Danger for the Secular State?</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>2. Private Equity and Hedge Funds – Friend or Foe?</b> .....	<b>II</b>
<b>3. USA - What Next after the Elections?</b> .....	<b>II</b>
<b>4. What are Russia’s geopolitical ambitions?</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>5. Do We Need Economic Growth to Achieve More Sustainability?</b> .....	<b>IV</b>
<b>6. Climate Change Divide</b> .....	<b>IV</b>
<b>7. Virtual Worlds - Fiction or Reality ?</b> .....	<b>V</b>
ANNEX 2 : PUBLIC EYE AWARDS 2008 NOMINATIONS .....	VI

## DAVOS 2008 REPORT

As part of its Programme on Global Issues and Civil Society, CASIN attended the events organised parallel to the World Economic Forum (WEF) in Davos, for the fourth time in January 2007. The report will focus on the Public Eye Awards, the Open Forum, and Civil Society's impact, with particular emphasis on the main "NGOs and civil society" topics – such as climate change, water shortages, famine and human rights – which were discussed this year. Being co-organised by the WEF, the Open Forum has lost much of its old subversive tone and has become a round of consensual conferences. The Public Eye Awards remains more controversial, offering, for example, a number of awards to misbehaving multinational corporations.

This report has been compiled based on CASIN's participation in the event and an analysis of the major attending media.

### THE PUBLIC EYE AWARDS : DAVOS, JANUARY 23, 2008

#### Introducing the event

The Public Eye Awards is the Davos counter-event to the WEF and has already become an institution. It illuminates, for the general public, the shadowy side of globalisation and calls on transnational corporations to display at least a minimum of social and environmental commitment. For the fourth time, as part of this event, the two organisers – Pro Natura (Friends of the Earth Switzerland) and the Berne Declaration – presented awards for the most irresponsible corporations in various industries. For the second time, a corporation was honoured for exemplary implementation of social and environmental standards. A novelty this year was the "People's Award". Based on their opinions, people nominate 'misbehaving corporations' online, the winner receiving the 'People's Award'.

#### Awards & Winners: "Global players, Watch out, we are watching you!"



Thirty-four domestic and foreign corporations were selected for the Public Eye Awards 2008, based on irresponsible behaviour in the social (human rights violations, hazardous working conditions) and environmental (soil, air, water pollution) domains. In contrast, six NGOs from Switzerland, Germany and the UK applied for the positive award. From the nominees, the Public Eye organisers shortlisted three corporations for each category before they nominated one "winner".

<= Source: CASIN

## The Public Eye Global Award

The nuclear concern **Areva S.A.** received the Public Eye Global Award. This French state-owned company mines uranium in northern Niger. According to the Swiss Energy Foundation, who nominated Areva, this occurs under scandalous conditions; mine workers are not informed about health risks, and analysis shows radioactive contamination of air, water and soil. In his address, Almoustapha Alhacen, President of the local organisation Aghirin'man, which represents those affected, spoke of "suspicious deaths among the workers, caused by radioactive dust and contaminated groundwater". Moreover, he noted that workers with cancer are deliberately given false diagnosis at the company hospital.

The **shortlist** included Bayer CropScience and Dole Philippines Inc. **Bayer CropScience** is the world's largest pesticide producer. Behaviour for which it was nominated includes: engaging in "greenwashing"; the company develops seeds and herbicides for the controversial agrofuel plant Jatropha and using the UN to do its lobby work. **Dole Philippines** Inc. was nominated by the Ecumenical Institute for Labor Education and Research (EILER) in the Philippines for its lack of social and environmental policies. The EILER reported that workers, especially women, are exploited and face dangerous working conditions on pineapple plantations, in addition, it was suggested that the plantations are linked to water pollution.

## The Public Eye Swiss Award

**Glencore**, nominated by the Task Force Switzerland-Colombia, won the Public Eye Swiss Award. Task Force Switzerland-Colombia argued that the natural resources group (based in the tax-haven canton of Zug) operates with a minimum of transparency. It was suggested that, in Columbia, Glencore's coalmines have caused massive environmental pollution and health problems for the population. In addition, the top Swiss corporation is reportedly extremely hostile towards unions. The local union for the energy and mining sectors, Funtraenergetica, sent its lawyer, Sergio Beccera Moreno, to speak in Davos of infringements on the freedom of associations, paramilitary training camps on the mine's property, and permanent social dumping.

The **shortlist** included Erdöl Vereinigung (Petroleum Association) and Holcim Ltd. **Erdöl Vereinigung** was nominated by Greenpeace Switzerland for the use of a misleading slogan ("Heizen mit Öl : Für mehr Klimaschutz) in its advertisements and was denounced by the advertising industry's integrity watchdog in a precedent setting verdict against "greenwashing". **Holcim Ltd** was nominated by Tribal Welfare Society (TWS), India who pointed out their practice of systematically exploiting loopholes in Indian law. Furthermore, TWS suggested that the company disregards industry wide wage standards and customary compensation for land purchases, as well as engaging in illegal cartel agreements.

## The Public Eye Positive Award

**Hess Natur** received the Public Eye Positive Award for an organic cotton project in Burkina Faso, in collaboration with Swiss aid organisation Helvetas, and the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO). Nominated by Helvetas Switzerland, Hess Natur distributes textiles made mostly from biologically grown cotton (up to 98%) and is reportedly consistent in their implementation of fair social standards. Commenting on the award, Delphine Zoungrana, responsible for organic farming for the National Union of Burkina Faso Cotton Producers, noted that she hopes for “more such initiatives for fair wages and non-toxic agriculture, so that one day all people can live in dignity”.

The **shortlist** included Care Naturkost GmbH & Co and Soglio-Produkte AG. Rettet den Regenwald (Save the Rainforest, Germany), nominated **Care Naturkost** for its commitment to the import and export of raw material from controlled organic and biological cultivation (such as organic palm oil). Care Naturkost also initiates bio-certificates for producers. **Soglio-Produkte**, nominated by Gebana AG Switzerland, makes natural cosmetics with raw materials from the Swiss Alps. The company promotes activities that create value throughout the Alpine region and works closely with organic farmers.

## The Public Eye People’s Award



The Public Eye People’s Award was conferred for the first time. Receiving more than half of the over 10’000 online votes cast, the “winner” of this public ballot was once again **Areva**, followed by **Bayer CropScience** and **Glencore**. The decisive results of the new category show how closely the Public Eye reflects public opinion.

The four awards. Source: CASIN

## Audience and Atmosphere

The Public Eye Awards were attended by 200 people and took place on one afternoon. A large local presence was noticed, as seems to have been the case since the 2006 edition. Overall, this is consistent with the fact that event seems to attract more attention from a non-professional audience rather than from professional civil-society. Only four NGOs were “officially” present: Pro Natura, The Berne Declaration, Amnesty International and Attac.

**Susan Georges**, Attac co-founder and author, delivered the opening speech. She focused on the American financial recession and blamed the banks for it. She suggested that Adam Smith’s line: “All for ourselves and nothing for other people” had served as a

model for the “Davos people”. She also criticized the WEF 2008’s title, “The power of collaborative innovation”, finding the title too vague and misleading. According to Susan George, the “Davos people” foresaw neither climate change nor any of a series of financial crises. She suggested that the connections’ opportunities reinforce the sense of legitimacy of the “Davos people” and turn the Forum into a “social party”. Above all, she blamed their willingness to concentrate wealth in a few hands, advocating a series of policies including higher tax for the rich with redistribution to the vulnerable in society; debt cancellation; food sovereignty; free access to public goods such as water, health and education; as well as human and environmental rights.

**Bastien Girod**, a Green Party junior National Assembly member, stressed in his allocution the importance of establishing a regulatory framework regarding transparency and fair trade. He argued that, the consumer has to take up his or her responsibility – the consumer should be a “consumactor” – he or she should be able to trace any product he or she buys and 100% of the merchandise should be the result of fair trade. He believes that a positive and decent globalisation is possible if politicians and consumers collaborate closely.

The initial moderator, Melanie Winiger, was sick and was therefore replaced by the Swiss-German comedian **Patrick Frey**, who introduced each speaker with a touch of humour. During his speech, another comedian burst into the scene, dressed as Anne Lauvergeon, CEO of Areva, and “collected” the Global Award. Two Swiss rappers, **Stress** and **Greis** also entertained the audience by performing compositions related to the defence of the environment.

**Olivier Classen**, the Berne Declaration’s representative, concluded the ceremony with the Public Eye’s slogan: “Global players, Watch out, we are watching you!”. He is firmly convinced that civil society has a role to play, both as an external observer as well as in penalising corporations who flout global norms of good environmental and social practice.

## Concluding remarks

Strangely, at a time where climate change and fair trade have become major issues in the media, the Public Eye Award seems to stand out. The audience was mainly composed of locals and did not attract many young people or NGOs. While the room was full, everybody could find a seat and no one was standing outside, waiting to come in. Also, while the audience approved of the nominations and dreams of a better world, the ceremony itself – still very much necessary – has become an institution and maybe lost its earlier flavour of subversion.



## THE OPEN FORUM – DAVOS, JANUARY 24–26, 2008

### Introducing the event

For the sixth consecutive year, the World Economic Forum and the Federation of Swiss Protestant Churches co-organised the Open Forum, which took place in Davos from January 24 to 26, 2008. The Open Forum offers a possibility for an open debate on globalisation and its consequences through seven very different sessions:

- The Comeback of Religion – A Potential Danger for the Secular State?
- Private Equity and Hedge Funds – Friend or Foe?
- USA: What Next after the Elections?
- What are Russia’s geopolitical ambitions?
- Do We Need Economic Growth to Achieve More Sustainability?
- Climate Change Divide
- Virtual Worlds – Fiction or Reality?



Source: CASIN

Most sessions were attended by 250 to 300 individuals who participated on a first-come, first-served basis. Again, the audience was mainly composed of locals of all age groups. A couple of young Americans came from the American School in Geneva to attend the session “USA: What Next after the Elections?”. A few panellists from the WEF also attended parts of the Open Forum, including Mohammad Khatami, the President of the Foundation for Dialogue Among Civilizations and Former President of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and Pascal Couchepin, President of the Swiss Confederation. The sessions were organised as panels and the speakers represented a good balance of government, private sector and civil society representatives. The last thirty minutes of each session allowed for questions and answers from the audience.

### “The Comeback of Religion – A Potential Danger for the Secular State?”

The opening session of the Open forum was entitled “**The Comeback of Religion – A Potential Danger for the Secular State?**” and tackled issues such as the separation of church and state, the cohabitation of religious and secularised states, and the guarantee of religious plurality. The panel was composed of **Mohammad Khatami**, the President of the Foundation for Dialogue Among Civilizations and Former President of the Islamic Republic of Iran, **Andreas Kley**, Professor for Constitutional Law at the University of Zurich in Switzerland, **Ingrid Mattson**, President of the Islamic Society of North America, **Ulrich Schlüer**, Co-organiser of the Minaret Initiative from the Swiss People’s Party and **Thomas Wipf**, President of the Council of the Federation of Swiss Protestant Churches. Thanks to a good choice of speakers, the debate was enriching and several interesting points were raised, shedding a refreshing light on both Islam and Christianity.

Khatami spoke from a moderate Islamic position and Wipf, from that of a Christian moderate. Schlüer argued as an extreme secularist and Kley represented the academic pole in the debate and focused on the importance of research. Kley noted an increase in interest in religiosity at Universities. He called for the creation of a Chair to conduct research on religious conflict, on integration of multiple religions in cases of migration. He stated that there is an urgent need for a scientific point of view regarding Muslim leaders, to study their life and their achievements.

Mattson, who spoke next, described how she was raised as a Christian in the USA, became agnostic and converted to Islam as a grown-up. She spoke of her surprise at discovering a longing for a connection to God and spirituality. Considering her background as woman raised with Christian values, her American nationality, and her education (she is a researcher on Islam at University level), the audience gave a great deal of credit to her testimony. Mattson balanced the debate by speaking for herself and for her community: she advocated for a Muslim community living in peace with its neighbours, respecting the law and the Constitution. She pointed out that there were over 1000 interpretations of *charia* and that Islam was debated among Muslims themselves and that no one should consider Islam as a single religion. To her, the historical heritage of a country should always be distinguished from its legal foundation. Schlüer completely agreed on that point, arguing strongly in support of a complete separation of powers. Khatami stressed a couple of interesting points: firstly that the problem comes from extremism – any type of extremism – and not from religion. He noted that, not only has extremism created hatred but it has also contributed to a lack of spirituality. He stated his belief in theocracy but specified that a religious state should never work against freedom, progress or human rights. In this, Khatami distanced himself from the current Iranian policy. He also underlined a major difference between Christianity and Islam: in the case of the former, he argued, there has always been a clear separation of church and state, while in the latter tradition, religion has always played a key role in the establishment and running of government, cities and education.

To conclude, all panellists agreed that we are witnessing “a comeback of religion” but all did so for different reasons. For Khatami, there is a vacuum, which allows or generates such a comeback. Wipf interpreted it as a way to seek answers regarding our future. He distinguished faith, which is a private matter, and religion, which deals with societal issues. He suggested that young people turn to religion because they are afraid of what will happen to the planet. Kley, as mentioned before, noted an increase in interest at Universities. Schlüer was also positive about the “comeback”, noting that he sees it in the “massive” migration of Muslims to Switzerland, in their desire to build minarets. Mattson again spoke from personal experience of her need for religion and the way in which this led her to convert to Islam.

### **“Private Equity and Hedge Funds – Friend or Foe?”**

The evening session of the first day raised the question: **“Private Equity and Hedge Funds – Friend or Foe?”**. Private equity and hedge funds allow pension funds, foundations and wealthy individuals to invest in alternatives to shares and bonds. These investments are important for economic growth and have enabled the creation of many start-ups. Nevertheless, critics argue that private equity funds and hedge funds put short-term

returns before the sustained development of companies. Two panellists, **Philip Yea**, Chief Executive of 3i Group Plc in the UK, and **Paul Fletcher**, Senior Managing Partner of Actis Capital LLP, also in the UK, both represented the liberal wing in the debate. On the other side, **Christian Levrat**, Member of Parliament for the Social Democratic Party in Switzerland and **Hand Ruh**, former Professor of Theology and Social Ethics and President of Blue Value in Switzerland, defended a conservative approach.

Levrat and Ruh were concerned that private equity would often lead to the dismantling of a company with a view to making a quick profit, rather than support for long-term development. They suggested that strict regulations are required to protect the economy and corporations from the influence of private equity and hedge funds. They worried that ILO standards were not maintained after many take-overs and denounced the lack of ethics and transparency of such new investment tools.

In response, Yea clearly distinguished between the two investment instruments: private equity is a medium-term investment tool which allows investment in companies on a 2-5 year agenda, whereas hedge funds allow investment in financial instruments to change on an hourly basis. During the whole discussion, Yea and Fletcher defended their company's position by arguing that the return on investment over the year was 25%; that this created job opportunities and that their business increased the value of pension funds etc. However, Yea acknowledged there was an information gap between the traders and the public. The lack of academics, researchers and reports on the subject constituted the main cause of this information gap. Furthermore, he noted that this specific business is relatively new – only 20 years old – and reserved for highly qualified professionals because of the stakes and the running risks.

The whole debate remained on a theoretical level because the “conservative wing” lacked both practical experience and an economic background. Indeed, the discussion would have gained substance with the addition of a panellist from the field, someone whose company were taken over, perhaps. To their defence, Yea and Fletcher were demagogues and drilled to defend their companies' interests. The topic (too specific for a large audience) and the panellists (too uneven) were not well chosen and the “hedge fund” problematic was under-debated. The low attendance also revealed a lack of widespread interest in such a specific topic.

### **“USA: What Next after the Elections?” & “What are Russia's geopolitical ambitions?”**

The Friday sessions, dedicated to the USA and Russia, deserve a comparative analysis. Indeed, the question “**What are Russia's geopolitical ambitions?**” has to be considered in the context of the presidential elections scheduled for March 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2008. Hence, it is much more interesting to compare the attitudes of the US and Russia towards the election of a new president, how they deal with changes in government, and how they defend their party interests.

The morning session, “**USA: What Next after the Elections?**” was predictably popular and attracted a younger audience as well as a certain number of Americans. Three out of five speakers dominated the discussion with their knowledge, experience and rhetoric. **Kay**

**Bailey Hutchinson**, a Republican Senator from Texas is close to the Bush family and took part in Georges W. Bush's campaigns. **Howard B. Dean III**<sup>1</sup>, Chairman of the Democratic National Congress (DNC) and **Robert Edgar**, former general Secretary of the National Council of Churches & CEO and President of "Common Cause", are both democrats. **Olaf Gersemann**, Deputy Business Editor at *Welt am Sonntag*, Germany, represented the European perspective but did not have much to add to the topic. It was practically impossible to compete with three politicians with such a depth of experience from the field. The **Ayatollah Dr. Mahdi Hadavi**, President and Founder of the Porch of Wisdom Institution in the Islamic Republic of Iran, was initially invited to balance the panels and bring a new perspective to the debate but used the discussion only to further his own political agenda and his comments were largely irrelevant. For example, he repeatedly argued that the US violates human rights and that the Middle East did not need outside interference in order to solve its problems.

Under the leadership of President Putin, Russia has established a new assertiveness, using its economic position and energy resources to reinforce its influence and power. The question "**What are the geopolitical ambitions of Russia?**" has become central. Indeed, the international community wonders if the upcoming presidential elections in Russia and in the US will play out in this context, as well as what the possible scenarios might be in these two countries?

The speaker **Alexei Pushkov**, Author, Anchor and Executive Producer of the Postscript TV Show at the TV-Centre (TVC) in Russia, was a virulent defender of Putin and Russia's foreign and domestic policy. An excellent orator, he was both sincere – bluntly admitting that Russia was not a democracy – and a demagogue – arguing that Russia's territorial integrity was threatened by the international community. Professor **Horst M. Telschik**, Chairman of the Munich Conference on Security Policy in Germany, also supported Russia's policy although he took a more moderate position to that of Alexei Pushkov. As for **Charles Grant**, Director of the Centre for European Reform in UK, he represented the European point of view in the debate and tried to act as a counterweight to Pushkov's speech.



Speakers during the session on Russia's geopolitical ambitions. Source: CASIN.

<sup>1</sup> Howard B. Dean is currently involved in the Democrats' campaign.

**The question “What next after the elections” received very different answers, depending on the American or the Russian perspective.**

Pushkov argued that nothing will change after the Russian presidential elections because the next president, Dimitri Medvedev (currently first Deputy Prime Minister) is Putin’s pupil and even Putin’s puppet. He suggested that Putin would keep his influence on foreign policy since his “pupil” does not have much experience in the field. Pushkov noted that, when Putin became president in 1999, he decided to reorganise the country, to centralise the administration and to strengthen the state. He argued that Putin would like Russia to both become a full member of the European community as well as to play a role on the international stage. In addition, he suggested that, in the context of ongoing war in Chechnya, the rise of a powerful Chinese neighbour, as well as an American presence in Eastern Europe, Russia will act to reinforce its territorial unity.

Paradoxically, Pushkov presented Russia as both a victim and as a strong power. On one hand, he argued that the West humiliated Russia after the fall of communism and subsequent economic constraints. He recounted that, after having rebuilt the country, Putin decided to re-take control of energy resources and give priority to Russian corporations. For instance, contracts held by BP & Shell were reconsidered because the terms were disadvantageous to Russia. He asserted that control of energy resources, and of gas in particular places Russia in a position of power relative to Europe. To conclude, Pushkov affirmed his belief that the upcoming elections would bring no change in Russian policy, because there would be no real change in government.

On the contrary, Republicans and Democrats both promised political change after the American elections on November 4<sup>th</sup>. It was affirmed that both parties reject the legacy of the Bush administration and want to restore international relations by building new partnerships. While the Republicans in the debate were vague about the changes their administration – likely to be led by Senator John McCain – would bring, the Democrats in the room made clearer propositions. They asserted that they would move to close Guantanamo and all secret prisons; improve health care and the educational system; as well as fight poverty and climate change. Edgar painted the US as a “humble” superpower, which will work to create new partnerships and restore its moral authority. Nevertheless, Ayatollah Dr. Mahdi Hadavi maintained his position that US foreign policy will not change, no matter which party wins the November elections.

As for Gersemann, he contended that the new president will adopt a more protective attitude towards trade, foreseeing consequences for Europe’s economy. Dean disagreed, asserting that Democrats will not bring in protectionist measures regarding trade with Europe, eventually with developing countries. To conclude, he claimed that, while Russia pursues protectionist policies, America seeks openness, partnerships and international recognition. However, American’s speech has to be considered in the context of the elections, where candidates often make a lot of promises they might not be able to keep.

### “Do We Need Economic Growth to Achieve More Sustainability?”

The following discussion was under-debated though the speakers came from all continents and had different backgrounds. Australia (Sharan Burrow), Latin America (Ricardo Hausmann), India (John Itty), Africa (Okereke-Onyiuke) and Europe (Pascal Couchepin) were represented in the panel: only East Asia and North America were missing. The moderator, Dirk Schutz, Editor-in-chief of *Bilanz*, was abrupt and never managed to initiate a dialogue between the panellists. No one actually tackled the issue of economic growth leading to increased levels of ecological and social sustainability. All speakers expressed “great faith” in technology to solve environmental issues but no one came up with any concrete propositions, nor did they even consider the possible damage economic growth could generate. As Sharan Burrow, President of the International Trade Union Confederation in Brussels, summarised, we all want “green jobs” but we reject the idea that climate change will imperil our economic future.

The whole discussion focused on the sole question “Do we need economic growth to achieve sustainability and improve social welfare?”. **John Itty**, Professor at the School of People’s Economics in India was quite virulent on the topic. He explained that the number of poor, of children in the workforce, of suicides, and of malnourished children had considerably risen in India as a result of economic growth. He argued that a clear conflict exists between the “economic market” and the “real local economy”: for him, the current system does not take traditional values such as family, respect or trust into account and therefore does not correspond to the needs of the people. The only proposal made by **Ricardo Hausmann**, Director of the Centre for International Development and Professor of the Practice of Economic Development at the JFK School of Government at Harvard University, was for India to expand small and medium-sized cities to absorb farmers and provide them with a decent living in clean and organised towns.

**Okereke-Onyiuke**, Director-General of the Nigerian Stock Exchange, spoke of the cultural gap in her country between Christians and Muslims. She reported that the North of Nigeria is economically sustainable, in contrast to the South where the majority of Muslims live. It was noted that each Muslim family raises about sixteen children, resulting in a population explosion with which economic growth cannot keep pace. Because of high rates of corruption in African countries, she argued that economic intervention by the government is no solution.

**Pascal Couchepin**, President of the Swiss Confederation, expressed his trust in regulations and policies – but not subsidies – to develop local economies. Ricardo Hausmann, speaking last, suggested that governments must provide both transport and security in order to expand the market without interfering with it.

Overall, this was a poor discussion, although the panellists had interesting experiences to share. This might have been due to the dry subject as well as to a lack of engagement on the part of the panellists.

## “Climate Change Divide”

The challenge of climate change is to find an approach acceptable across diverse countries and regions. One of the main questions is “How can the divide between developed and emerging countries be bridged, and how can the latter be better integrated into protecting the global climate?”. Of course, the panellists also tackled issues such as the efficiency of current climate protection policies and the development of alternative energy sources (such as biofuels).

At the beginning, the panellists skimmed over these subjects because the moderator, **Sonja Hasler**, chose to focus the discussion on the question of responsibility. **C.S. Kiang**, Chairman at the Peking University Environment Fund in China, soon took the lead, however, and clearly enunciated the relevant question. For him, we need to create a new mindset, since it is the first time mankind has had to fight together. He argued that we must seek mutual understanding and cooperation, rather than division. He asserted that we should think “out of the box” and look for solutions, that we should look in terms of benefits and not of costs anymore, that we should work on new proposals.

**Luiz Fernando Furlan**, Chairman of the Board of GALF Empreendimentos in Brazil, completely agreed with Kiang. He suggested that people’s commitment is strong and that a lack of information is to blame. He posited that any available possibilities should be advertised, in order to allow each individual to move ahead, arguing that change will come from below. He used multiple examples from Brazil, calling it a leader in the field, especially in using ethanol and educating the next generation.

**Ichiro Kamoshita**, Minister of the Environment and in Charge of Global Environmental Problems in Japan, insisted on the need to share the latest technologies with emerging countries and to support such countries with funds. As an example, **Achim Steiner**, Executive Director on the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in Kenya, called on industrial countries to support Africa with subsidies and investment in renewable energies, thus allowing it to jump one technology generation and not develop nuclear energy. Moreover, he advocated for international environmental regulations and for transparency, suggesting that the consumer has the right to know at a gas station whether a particular biofuel was produced sustainably.

**Christian Mummenthaler**, Swiss Re’s Chief Risk Officer in Switzerland, concluded that Europe should stop its policy of agricultural subsidies because a more rational economical and trade policy would have positive effects on climate change. He pointed out the complexity of the issue because of its interrelation with food security, the price of food, water shortages, health, migration, immigration and political stability. He urged corporations to collaborate with NGOS, which have more experience on the field.

In closing, all speakers agreed that collaboration, education and immediate political action were the only way to deal with this delicate issue.

## “Virtual Worlds – Fiction or Reality?”

Tools such as Second Life and Facebook are new ways of taking life to the virtual sphere, for example by allowing people to attend conferences or seminars or to live out social desires anonymously, without restraints, risks or sanctions. More and more people are turning to virtual reality to establish who they are, what they know, who they interact with and how. In this context, the boarder between the virtual world and reality becomes ever thinner and is likely to influence our moral framework.

**Philip Rosedale**, CEO of Linden labs/Second Life and **Reid Hoffman**, Chairman and President of LinkedIn Corporation in the US, defended the positive aspects of virtual worlds. They believe “social software” helps people to establish their identity, to interact, to communicate and to socialise with one another. Hoffman compared these new media to the painters’ pallet, which allows for finer expression.

Rosedale drew the attention of the public to the fact that virtual worlds were not games. They are part of reality, they extend reality, they add value to reality but they are not a game and they do not replace reality. **Florence Develey**, Pastor in Switzerland, even added that Second Life was a form of reality. To her, what one experiences on Second Life is as real as what one can live in one’s real life but that one should not try to connect these two realities. She asserted that virtual worlds are a new capacity and can be used as an additional tool to respond to different situations.

**Rafael Capurro**, Professor in Information management and information ethics in Stuttgart Media University, expressed more mixed feelings. First of all, he argued that, while these new media reduce distance, they also neutralise nearness and do not bring us closer. For him, the dangerous temptation is to create an artificial paradise – what mankind has always done – but to forget about reality. For instance, in Second Life, climate change simply does not exist and it could be dangerous to push this issue from our minds. The distinction between virtual worlds and reality is a full component of our technical world today. **Joseph Weizenbaum**, Professor of Computer Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, made an extremely negative speech on these new media. He reported that, as a Professor, he had noticed a decline in our ability to use language effectively, leading him to reject the “abusive” use of the word “communication” that is made to qualify virtual worlds. To him, “exchanging texts and others” on the web does not deserve to be called communication because the first purpose of communication is to learn language and to express oneself. His main concerns are the loss of linguistic ability and the loss of sense of responsibility. Indeed, sanctions and regulations do not exist on Second Life and he expressed a fear that the next generation will not understand the meaning of either morality or responsibility. To that argument, **Rosedale** replied that there may be no sanctions in Second Life, but you cannot hurt anybody either. However, he agreed that the software did not solve conflicts, since users even fight in it. Nevertheless, he argued that it has turned from a game into a business and meetings platform, a change that demonstrates the potential of such a system.

To conclude, the level of the discussion was pretty high at the beginning but tended to go round in circles at the end. The debate remained on the “fiction-reality” level and the generational issue as well as the technological one was missed. The question of



“morality” was highly debated by Weizenbaum and Capurro, the other panellists not really getting the point. However, this session was one of the most instructive and interesting to follow.

### **Concluding remarks**

Topics for the seven sessions were carefully chosen in relation to their pertinence in our world today. Indeed, political, religious, economic and environmental themes represent highly debated topics, due to their importance in our everyday lives. Climate change and environmental issues, for example, were raised in almost every single panel. Surprisingly, these seven conferences were not linked by a common theme or slogan as previously<sup>2</sup>. The best sessions were the ones held on religion and on fictional worlds, due to their pertinence, as well as to excellent speakers who were able to engage in real debate and not merely express an opinion. The weakest sessions were those that tackled economic issues, in part because the topic is dryer and less accessible to a large audience but also because panellists were not well chosen, misbalanced or just disengaged. Also, while governments, business leaders and academics were well represented in the panels, there was a clear lack of civil society actors and of women.

---

<sup>2</sup> 2006's theme at the Open Forum was “Respecting, Crossing and Shifting Boundaries” and 2005's “When is economy ethical?”.

## PROTESTS, WORLD SOCIAL FORUM & CIVIL SOCIETY

Several anti- WEF protests took place in Switzerland, in the cities of Bern, Saint-Gallen, Zurich and Basel. Some of these protests were organised jointly with the alternative forum “The Other Davos” and the World Social Forum (WSF).

### Protests

The first protest was held in **Bern**, the capital of Switzerland, on January 19, 2008. The organisers, the “Alliance for a Global Opposition”, had originally been allowed to demonstrate by city officials, but the authorities reversed their decision for fear of violence. Thus, the police detained about 200 protesters who took part in the “illegal” demonstration. A number of protesters throwing bottles met with police using tear gas and water cannons. Observers said that the police also used rubber bullets. Meanwhile, about 150 people demonstrated peacefully against the World Economic Forum in the north-eastern city of **St.-Gallen**.

Attac Switzerland organized the 8<sup>th</sup> edition of the forum, **The Other Davos**, held at the Volkhaus in Zurich on January 25, as part of the WSF Global Action Day. A satirical cruise, entitled “Aboard the *MS Neoliberalism: Pleasure Cruise or Piracy*” tackled various issues such as financial markets, taxation, justice, food and agricultural policy, and resistance in Latin America. Demonstrations took place in **Zurich** on that day and in **Bern** and **Basel** on January 26, as a result of the WSF Global Day of Action.



Protests in Bern. Source: <http://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2008/01/389914.html>

## **The World Social Forum: “Act Locally, Think Globally”**

Since 2001, the WSF has taken place parallel – and in opposition – to the WEF in Davos. The WSF has become one of the most important places for discussion and debate for the movement for a different kind of globalisation. This year marks the debut of the “decentralized WSF”, code for the absence of a single big counter-meeting to Davos in favour of many smaller ones. The Global Day of Action, called by the World Social Forum on January 26, 2008, was carried out in every continent, with as many as 900 simultaneous actions by an alliance of movements against neo-liberal globalisation, war, patriarchy, racism, colonialism, and environmental disasters. Following a central theme of “act locally, think globally,” the WSF global network gave visibility to struggles around the world and an ever-growing web of people who believe in making another world possible.

From New Orleans to Kenya, from Pakistan to Colombia, from Greenland to Australia, people all over the world participated in the Global Day of Action as a representation of their daily successes in building alternatives to a corporate-centric world. The effectiveness of the day of action will be judged from two perspectives: the mobilisation and local identities as well as the political impact on civil societies, governments, corporations and media. The WSF seems to steam out and whether it will rise again from its ashes in 2009 in Porto Algere remains an open question.

## **Civil Society**

Astonishingly, only a few NGOs attend the WEF, the Public Eye Awards or the Open Forum. NGOs such as Amnesty International, Transparency International, WWF, and Greenpeace International, among others, officially represented civil society at the WEF. Apart from the organisers, such as the Bern Declaration, Pro Natura (Friends of the Earth Switzerland), and the Federation of Swiss Protestant Churches (Skeps), most NGOs decided to boycott the forum. Indeed, since demonstrations are forbidden in Davos, and since the Open Forum is jointly organised with the WEF, NGOs have had to find a new platform for resistance and communication. Since 2001, the WSF was the international counter-WEF event but is not currently able to play this role. Moreover, in the absence of a strong counter-event or demonstrations, the media have tended to transmit information on the WEF rather than relaying critical voices. Having said that, the Public Eye Awards and the WSF received decent media coverage, unlike the Open Forum. Apart from the session “The Comeback of Religion – A Potential Danger for the Secular State?” boosted by the presence of the imminent Mohammed Khatami, hardly any sessions of the Open Forum were reported in the media.

## **Concluding remarks: Is the WEF shifting to “creative capitalism”?**

One should not interpret the weak echo of all movements and conferences as a sign of diminishing interest in societal and environmental issues – both highly and regularly debated in all new newspapers – but rather as a lack of interest in the form of demonstration itself. Indeed, protests do not raise the enthusiasm of as many people as

they used to and the act of demonstration itself – in this specific context of the World Economic Forum – has almost become null and void. However, the protests have diminished also because the WEF has started to integrate in its agenda topics dear to NGOs, such as water shortages, climate change, human rights violations, and food and agriculture security alongside themes such as terrorism, security in the Middle East and financial markets. From the WSF slogan “Act Together for Another World” to the WEF’s “Power of Collaborative Innovation” is only one small step. An interesting shift occurred here with the “highjack” of the NGOs agenda by the “Davos people”. Indeed, the anti-poverty campaigner and rock star Bono told of his disappointment at the lack of commitment to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of driving down poverty in Africa. British Prime Minister Gordon Brown also called on the world to refocus on the MDGs and argued that a World Bank for Development should be founded. Such an institution would lend financial resources to developing countries in order to allow them to invest in renewable energies. Additionally, UN secretary-general Ban Ki-moon and 2007 Peace Nobel Prize Rajendra K. Pachauri stressed that climate change and water shortages posed a risk to economic growth, human rights, health, safety and national security. Even the issues of human rights violations, torture and arbitrary detention have been tackled by business leaders under the lead of Karen Tse, founder and CEO of International Bridges to Justice (IBJ). On top of that, a major intervention was made by Microsoft billionaire Bill Gates who announced a new direction as he pledged \$306 million in grants to develop farming in poor countries, leading the charge for corporate responsibility at a major meeting of business chiefs. Gates said “If we are serious about ending hunger and poverty around the world, we must be serious about transforming agriculture for small farmers, most of whom are women. The challenge here is to design a system including profit and recognition to do more for the poor.” As part of this intervention he called for a new form of “creative capitalism”. Such interventions and acts show a clear incursion of civil society in the WEF. Moreover, the “selected” and “secret” forum has never been so accessible, since some sessions (including the Open Forum) are available on [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com). No one would be so foolish to believe that the WEF had become a fully transparent and democratic conference but, step-by-step, it seems to open its door. Whether the politicians and the corporations will keep their promises is still to be seen but the integration of social and environmental themes in the agenda of business leaders may be evidence of a real victory for NGOs after ten years of fighting.

## SOURCES : ARTICLES & PRESS RELEASES

### Articles

« Davos fêtera Condi Rice plutôt que Sharon ou Angelina » par Elisabeth Eckert, in *La Tribune de Genève*, 17 janvier 2008, [www.tdg.ch](http://www.tdg.ch)

« Le WEF propose aux internautes de « participer » à Davos », in *24 Heures*, 17 janvier 2008, [www.24heures.ch](http://www.24heures.ch)

« 200 Anti-WEF Protesters Held by Police » by Michael Fichter, in *Associated Press*, 19 January 2008, [www.ap.google.com](http://www.ap.google.com)

« 200 anti-globalisation demonstrators detained in Switzerland », in *ChinaDaily*, 20 January 2008, [www.chinadaily.com.cn](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn)

“The world could be very different from how it is today”, by Candido Grzybowski, in *Inter Press Service News Agency*, 22 January 2008, [www.ipsnews.net](http://www.ipsnews.net)

« Anti-Davos Gatherings Go Smaller, but Global », in *New York Times*, 22 January 2008, [www.dealbook.blogs.nytimes.com](http://www.dealbook.blogs.nytimes.com)

« Karen Tse Leads Davos Exchange on the Prevention of Torture », in *International Bridges to Justice*, 22 janvier 2008, [www.ibj.org](http://www.ibj.org)

« Davos : les altermondialistes se donnent rendez-vous en 2009 », in *Le Courrier international*, 24 janvier 2008, [www.courrierinternational.com](http://www.courrierinternational.com)

« A Davos, un Nobel tape du poing sur la table », in *Swissinfo.ch*, 24 janvier 2008, [www.swissinfo.ch](http://www.swissinfo.ch)

« UN Chief Urges World To Give Looming Water Crises Priority », in *CNNMoney.com*, 24 January 2008, [www.money.cnn.com/news](http://www.money.cnn.com/news)

“Possible Violent Anti-WEF Demonstrations in Downtown Bern”, in *Overseas Security Advisory Council*, 24 January 2008, [www.osac.gov](http://www.osac.gov)

“Gordon Brown veut une Banque mondiale de l’environnement”, in *Le Temps*, 25 janvier 2008, [www.letemps.ch](http://www.letemps.ch)

“Bono urges renewed focus on world poverty”, by Sean O’Grady, in *The Independent*, 25 January 2008, [www.independent.co.uk/news](http://www.independent.co.uk/news)

“WEF Takes on Terrorism, Terribly”, by Ravi kanth Devarakona, in *Inter Press Service News Agency*, 25 January 2008, [www.ipsnews.net](http://www.ipsnews.net)

“Bill Gates’ new project: Farming”, by Barry Neild, in *CNN.com*, 25 January 2008, [www.cnn.com](http://www.cnn.com)

“WEF experts focus on water scarcity”, in *TradaArabia*, 26 January 2008, [www.tradearabia.com/news](http://www.tradearabia.com/news)

“WEF leaders want action on poverty vows”, in *TradaArabia*, 26 January 2008, [www.tradearabia.com/news](http://www.tradearabia.com/news)

“A whole new world”, in *The Guardian*, 26 January 2008, [www.commentisfree.guardian.co.uk](http://www.commentisfree.guardian.co.uk)

“Global Action Day against WEF and war”, in *PGA Newswire*, 26 January 2008, [www.agpna.revolt.org/aggregator](http://www.agpna.revolt.org/aggregator)

“WSF Global Day of Action: Act Locally, Think Globally”, in *Global Indymedia Features*, 29 January 2008, [www.agpna.revolt.org/aggregator](http://www.agpna.revolt.org/aggregator)

## Websites

The Berne Declaration	<a href="http://www.evb.ch/publiceye">www.evb.ch/publiceye</a>
The Open Forum	<a href="http://www.forumblog.org/openforum">www.forumblog.org/openforum</a>
The Other Davos	<a href="http://www.otherdavos.net">www.otherdavos.net</a>
The Public Eye Awards	<a href="http://www.publiceye.ch">www.publiceye.ch</a>
The World Economic Forum	<a href="http://www.weforum.com">www.weforum.com</a>
The World Social Forum	<a href="http://www.wsf2008.net">www.wsf2008.net</a>
Youtube	<a href="http://www.youtube.com">www.youtube.com</a>

## Others

Most of the report’s writing is based on attendance at the conferences by CASIN staff.  
Copyright: If not mentioned otherwise, all pictures were taken by CASIN staff .

### OPEN FORUM 2008 PROGRAMME

During the Annual Meeting of the World Economic Forum, the Federation of Swiss Protestant Churches and the Forum will co-organize discussions for the general public. These events will be held in conjunction with the Forum's Annual Meeting 2008. The Open Forum was first organized in 2003. It offers a possibility for an open debate on globalisation and its consequences. In past years, the following overall topics were discussed:

- Globalisation or Deglobalisation for the benefit of the poorest?
- When is the economy ethical?
- Respecting, crossing and shifting boundaries

In 2008, the sessions of the Open Forum will once again help participants to share their opinion on world major problems, by addressing the following topics:

#### Thursday January 24

1. 12:45-14:15 - The Comeback of Religion – A Potential Danger for the Secular State?
2. 18:00-19:30 - Private equity and Hedge Funds – Friend or Foe?

#### Friday January 25

3. 12:45-14:15 - USA – What next after the elections?
4. 18:00-19:30 – What are Russia's geopolitical ambitions?

#### Saturday January 26

5. 12:45-14:15 - Do we need Economic Growth to get more Sustainability?
6. 15:30-17:00 - Climate Change Divide
7. 18:00-19:30 - Virtual worlds – Fiction or Reality?

As in past years, the sessions will take place in the main hall of the Swiss Alpine Middle School on Guggerbachstrasse 3, in Davos. The debates will be in German and English with simultaneous translation into both languages. The Open Forum sessions are open to the public, no registration is required and people can get in on a first come first serve basis.

**Websites:** [www.weforum.com](http://www.weforum.com) & [www.forumblog.org/openforum](http://www.forumblog.org/openforum)

All videos are available on [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com)

### 1. The Comeback of Religion – A Potential Danger for the Secular State?

Thursday January 24 2008 12.45 - 14.15

Secularisation was a decisive step towards peaceful cohabitation of different religions in Europe. However, not every religion considers the separation of state and religion as a natural course of action. For example, Islam is a unity between sacred and profane spaces of society. Thus, Islamic states claim that the state represents Islamic communities and that state law is rooted in religious law.

- 1) How can states in Europe guarantee religious plurality and religious freedom while simultaneously maintaining their own forms of life and culture embedded in Christian values and traditions?
- 2) How does the Islam see the relationship between state and religion? Are there any repercussions on the cohabitation of different religions in secularised states?
- 3) Does Islam face a similar question to the one Christians have intensely struggled with since the time of Enlightenment – namely, recognition of a separation of state and religion?

#### **Speakers**

- **Mohammad Khatami**, President, Foundation for Dialogue Among Civilizations; President of the Islamic Republic of Iran (1997-2005)
- **Ingrid Mattson**, President, Islamic Society of North America, USA
- **Ulrich Schlüer**, Co-organiser of the Minaret Initiative, Swiss People's Party, Switzerland
- **Thomas Wipf**, President of the Council, Federation of Swiss Protestant Churches, Switzerland

#### **Moderation**

- **Marco Meier**, Swiss Television

## **2. Private Equity and Hedge Funds – Friend or Foe?**

Thursday January 24 2008 18.00 - 19.30

Private equity funds and hedge funds allow pension funds, foundations and wealthy individuals to invest in alternatives to shares and bonds. These investments are important for economic growth and have enabled the creation of many start-ups. Nonetheless critics argue that private equity funds and hedge funds put short-term returns before the sustained development of companies.

- 1) Which funds are buying major companies?
- 2) What does private equity achieve in a company – strengthening and supporting long-term development or dismantling in view of quick profit?
- 3) Are regulations needed to protect the economy from the influence of private equity funds or hedge funds? Does their negative image make them more of a risk for our system?

#### **Speakers**

- **Christian Levrat**, Member of Parliament, Social Democratic Party, Switzerland
- **Hans Ruh**, em. Professor for Theology and Social Ethics; President Blue Value, Switzerland
- **Philip Yea**, Chief Executive, 3i Group Plc, United Kingdom
- **Paul Fletcher**, Senior Managing Partner Actis Capital LLP, United Kingdom

#### **Moderation**

- **Dirk Schütz**, Bilanz

## **3. USA - What Next after the Elections?**

Friday January 25 2008 12.45 - 14.15



2008 is an important presidential election year in the US. In this context, a number of questions arise as to the role and influence of the US in the world, militarily, economically and culturally. The current policies may change, but the question is how this will happen and how external actors will influence the process.”

- 1) How will the situation in Iraq influence US elections?
- 2) What will be US foreign and economic policy and what role will the US play after the elections? How will it impact other regions and countries, including Russia?
- 3) Besides the debates on US foreign policy, what are areas of interest in economic and social policies?

#### Speakers

- **Howard B. Dean III**, Chairman, Democratic National Committee (DNC), USA
- **Robert Edgar**, former General Secretary, National Council of Churches; CEO and President of Common Cause, USA
- **Olaf Gersemann**, Deputy Business Editor, Welt am Sonntag, Germany
- **Ayatollah Dr Mahdi Hadavi**, President and Founder, Porch of Wisdom, Institution, Islamic Republic of Iran
- **Robert Portman**, Of Counsel, Squire Sanders & Dempsey, USA

#### Moderation

- **Caspar Selg**, Radio DRS

### 4. What are Russia's geopolitical ambitions?

Friday January 25 2008 18.00 - 19.30

Under the leadership of President Putin, Russia has established a new assertiveness, opposing the integration of former USSR states into NATO and the US anti-missile defence system. Russia, using gas and oil, has exerted pressure on its relationship with Europe and other countries. The political and social tensions can influence the way Russia goes forward and its relations with other countries and regions.

- 1) What are the geopolitical ambitions of Russia?
- 2) How can upcoming presidential elections in Russia and the US play out in this context? And, what are possible future scenarios in these two countries or in other regions?
- 3) How will Russia continue to use its economic position and energy resources to reinforce its influence and power?

#### Speakers

- **Horst M. Teltschik**, Professor, Chairman of the Munich Conference on Security Policy, Germany
- **Alexei Pushkov**, Author, Anchor and Executive Producer, Postscript TV Show TV-Center (TVC), Russian Federation
- **Charles Grant**, Director Centre for European Reform, United Kingdom

#### Moderation

- **Urs Leuthard**, TV Host, Swiss Television SF DRS

## 5. Do We Need Economic Growth to Achieve More Sustainability?

Saturday January 26 2008 12.45 - 14.15

There are opposing views on whether economic growth can lead to increased levels of ecological and social sustainability. Its promoters argue that economic growth is needed to apply new technologies and sophisticated products which, in turn, lead to a more economic use of natural resources, more environmental protection and social progress. Yet, opponents claim that economic growth is based on global production and consumption patterns that are destroying our natural livelihoods and increasing social inequalities.

- 1) Do we need economic growth to solve existing social and ecological problems? Or, does economic growth create more costs than what it actually yields?
- 2) Can we expect a new economic boom triggered by innovations in environmentally-friendly technologies?
- 3) Which strategies of sustainability are the high-growth countries of Brazil, Russia, India or China following? How do these countries handle the conflict between economic growth and sustainability?

### Speakers

- **Sharan Burrow**, President, International Trade Union Confederation, Brussels
- **Ricardo Hausmann**, Director, Center for International Development, and Professor of the Practice of Economic Development, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, USA
- **John Itty**, Professor, School of People's Economics, India
- **Pascal Couchepin**, President of the Swiss Confederation, Federal Department of Home Affairs, Switzerland
- **Ndi Okereke-Onyiuke**, Director-General and Chief Executive Officer, The Nigerian Stock Exchange, Nigeria

### Moderation

- **Dirk Schütz**, Editor-in-Chief, Bilanz, Switzerland

## 6. Climate Change Divide

Saturday January 26 2008 15.30 - 17.00

The challenge of climate change is to find a coherent approach throughout countries and regions. There is a divide between the developed world which looks at the creation of long-term sustainable and balanced evolution, and the emerging countries which are under high pressure to deliver economic growth to allow them to tackle their social challenges.

- 1) How can the divide between developed and emerging countries be bridged, and how can the latter be better integrated into protecting global climate?
- 2) How efficient are the current climate protection policies of developed countries? Should states become carbon neutral and if so, how?
- 3) With regard to the development of alternative sources of energy such as biofuels, what are the implications on climate change?

## Speakers

- **Christian Mumenthaler**, Chief Risk Officer Swiss Re, Zürich
- **Luiz Fernando Furlan**, Chairman of the Board, GALF Empreendimentos, Brazil
- **C.S. Kiang**, Chairman, Peking University Environment Fund, Republic of China
- **Achim Steiner**, Executive Director, The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi
- **Ichiro Kamoshita**, Minister of the Environment, Minister in Charge of Global Environmental Problems, Japan

## Moderation

- **Sonja Hasler**, Swiss Television

## 7. Virtual Worlds - Fiction or Reality ?

Saturday January 26 2008 18.00 - 19.30

Tools such as Second Life and Facebook are new ways of extending life to the virtual space, for example, allowing us to attend Wimbledon while standing next to one of the players or living out our social desires anonymously without restraints nor risk of sanctions. More and more people are turning to virtual reality to establish who they are, what they know, who they interact with and how. This will influence how society is structured in the future and how real or fictive this virtuality will be.

- 1) In the context of the virtual worlds we are creating, what is the difference between fiction and reality?
- 2) With the ease of access to these virtual worlds, how do different generations react?
- 3) How does this world of immediate access, limitless social skills and unrestrained behaviour influence our moral framework?
- 4) Should we focus on the technological or human side of progress?

## Speakers

- **Rafael Capurro**, Professor, Information management and information ethics, Stuttgart Media University, Germany
- **Florence Develey**, Pastor, Switzerland
- **Joseph Weizenbaum**, former Professor of Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA
- **Reid Hoffman**, Chairman and President of LinkedIn Corporation, USA
- **Philip Rosedale**, CEO of Linden Labs/Second life

## Moderation

- **Loic Le Meur**, Seismic, USA



## PUBLIC EYE AWARDS 2008

### All Nominees in all Categories at a Glance

Company	Reason for nomination	Nominated by ...
<b>Public Eye GLOBAL Award</b>		
Acesita Energetica Ltda. (Brazil)	Brazil: The company (wood charcoal) is angling for an FSC-label even as it violates environmental legislation by planting monocultures in protected areas, logging in protected trees, polluting the soil, causing small streams to dry out.	E-Changer (Switzerland), Campo Vale Le and Forum de Convivencia Com o Semi Aride do Vale de Jequitinhonha (Brazil)
Anglo American (UK)	Africa/South America: world's second largest mining company feigns corporate responsibility with phony projects but actually exploits the miserable state of human rights in crisis regions.	War on Want (United Kingdom)
Areva (France)	Niger: the company mines uranium in this former French colony. Exceeds WHO limits for radioactivity, fails to inform mine workers and local residents about risks, open-air storage of radioactive materials.	Schweizerische Energie-Stiftung (Switzerland) [Swiss Energy Foundation]
Bayer CropScience (Germany)	USA: in 2006 the company's genetically modified rice contaminated one third of the US rice crop. Numerous lawsuits are pending but Bayer has yet to be convicted.	Greenpeace (Australia)
Bayer CropScience (Germany)	Worldwide/India: engages in systematic greenwashing. Latest example: Jatropha, the controversial agrofuel plant that Bayer CropScience is turning into a highly profitable crop.	Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung (Germany) [Forum Environment & Development]
Doe Run Perú (USA)	Peru: mining company (metal), operates a smelter that emits 1000 tons of lead, sulphur dioxide, cadmium, arsenic, etc. daily. Despite the irreversible damage this causes to human health and the environment the company refuses to implement its environmental program.	Civil Labor, Amigos de la Tierra Perú (Peru)
Dole Philippines (Philippines)	Philippines: workers, especially women, are exploited and face dangerous working conditions on the company's pineapple plantations. The plantations also pollute the water.	Ecumenical Institute for Labor Education and Research, Inc. "EILER" (Philippines)
ExxonMobil (USA)	USA/Europe: the largest private energy company supports organisations that deny climate change while posing as a paragon of environmental awareness in public. The company's marketing campaigns are misleading.	Friends of the Earth (Europe)
FFI/JKPL (India) and G-Star (Netherlands)	India: working conditions in their jeans factories violate labor laws. FFI/JPKL aggressively goes after labor law advocates. G-Star, the company's largest customer, says nothing.	Clean Clothes (Netherlands)

Gold Peak Company (China)	China: cadmium in battery production damages worker's health. Workers who require medical attention receive no financial support. The sources of contamination are not removed.	Cadmium Workers Coalition, Hong Kong Liaison Office "IHLO" (Hong Kong)
Golden Star Resources Ltd. (US-CDN)/ Bogoso Gold Limited (Ghana)	Ghana: this gold-mining company destroys sources of drinking water, violates environmental laws and prospects in illegal mines. Now the company wants to open a new mine and is intimidating local residents to get them to move out.	FoodFirst Informations- und Aktions-Netzwerk FIAN (Germany)
Gunns Limited (AUS)	Australia: a woodchip producer that logs virgin forests in Tasmania and poisons animals. Currently building a pulp mill that will emit huge amounts of greenhouse gases. Gunns Ltd. is also suing the Wilderness Society.	The Wilderness Society (Australia)
International Accounting Standards Board (UK)	worldwide: this private company sets international accounting standards and limits the reach of politics in this area. IASB is funded by large accounting firms around the world.	AABA/tax justice network (UK)
Monsanto (USA)	worldwide: Monsanto's favors monocultures and creates dependence on agrochemicals with its genetically modified plants. South America: Monsanto edges out small farmers; crop dusting poses a risk for the health of local populations.	Kleinbauern-Vereinigung (Switzerland) [Small Farmers' Association]
Montana Gold (Canada), Montana Exploradora S.A. (Guatemala)	Guatemala: the mining project „Marlin“ violates ecological, social, and human rights standards. Under pressure from Montana Exploradora S.A. arrest warrants were issued against local farmers who oppose the project.	Guatemala-Network Zürich (Switzerland)
Newmont Mining Corporation (USA)/Yanacocha in Cajamarca (Peru)	Peru: this gold mining company pollutes the drinking water and engages in fraudulent land deals that cause social conflicts, then hires private security forces that seal off the entire area.	Solidaritätsgruppe Schweiz-Peru (Switzerland)
Philips (Brazil)	Brazil: the president of Philips Brazil meddles in domestic politics and participates in dishonest campaigns.	Central Única dos Trabalhadores (Brazil)
PT Newmont Minahasa Raya (Indonesia), subsidiary of Newmont Mining Corporation (USA)	Indonesia: this mining company's operations have polluted Buyat Bay with arsenic and mercury. The local population and marine life in the bay were also contaminated as a result.	WALHI/Friends of the Earth Indonesia (Indonesia)
S.A. Mineral Resources Corporation Ltd. und Transworld Energy and Minerals Commodities Ltd. (South Africa/Australia)	South Africa: this mining company threatens a biodiversity hotspot on the coast, violates human rights and bribes the environmental authorities. The South African Human Rights Commission is on the case now and doing research.	Sustaining the Wild Coast (South Africa)
Shell (Netherlands)	Ireland: Shell is set to exploit a natural gas field off the Irish coast but the Irish population will not get any of the benefits. A pipeline will be built through delicate nature areas and residential areas.	Shell to Sea (Switzerland)
Sinar Mas (Indonesia)	Indonesia: this pulp and palm oil corporation is clearing rainforest areas that belong to small farmers. The government demands that the land be returned to its rightful owners. Sinar Mas ignores the government and in turn takes the farmers to court (for 4 million Euro).	Rettet den Regenwald e.V. (Germany) [Save the Rainforest]
UnionFenosa (Spain)	Latin America: this multinational energy corporation buys up electricity companies that have been privatized by the state and raises the price of electricity but neglects the upkeep of the distribution network.	Observatorio de Responsabilidad, Social Corporativa (alliance of NGOs)
Vedanta (UK)	India: a global company's mining projects destroy the land and the livelihood of the indigenous Adivasi-tribes.	ActionAid India (United Kingdom)
Wyeth Philippinen (USA)	Philippines: this company sells babyfood contaminated with traces of oil, rust, and steelshavings to consumers in the Philippines. The food inspections are lax and information is withheld.	Nurturers of the Earth (Philippines)

## Public Eye SWISS Award

BKW FMB Energie AG	Switzerland: engages in deceptive advertising. While hyping its CO2-free power at home the company is planning to build gas and coal fired power plants just across the border.	Schweizerische Energie-Stiftung (Switzerland) [Swiss Energy Foundation]
Credit Suisse	Malaysia: CS enabled Samling Global Ltd to go public at a time when their tropical wood business was embroiled in a controversy over illegal logging. The IPO provided Samling Global with US\$ 310 million of fresh capital.	Bruno Manser Fonds (Switzerland)
Credit Suisse	Indonesia: in May 2006 Brantes, a company with financial ties to Credit Suisse, drilled for natural gas. Then a volcano erupts, spewing up to 150'000 cubic meters of hot sludge every day and still active. 15000 people are affected. Brantas takes no responsibility.	Friends of the Earth (Europe)
Erdölvereinigung [Petroleum Association]	Switzerland: the Petroleum Association, a lobby-organisation for the oil industry suggests in a massive advertising campaign that heating with oil helps protect the climate and is reprimanded by the Swiss commission for Fairness in commercial communication, in October 2007.	Greenpeace Switzerland (Switzerland)
Glencore	Colombia: coal mining causes serious health problems for the population and pollutes the environment, especially the water. The company clears forests and fights the union.	Arbeitsgruppe Schweiz-Kolumbien (Switzerland) [Task-force Switzerland-Colombia]
Holcim	India: this Swiss corporation not only disregards the industrywide legal minimum wage but tries to challenge its legal basis in court. Holcim is also suspected of violating anti-trust laws.	Tribal Welfare Society (India)
Nestlé	worldwide: Nestlé engages in unethical advertising by suggesting that its baby formula is equivalent to breastmilk. Also, some Nestlé products in stores were found to have been chemically contaminated.	Nurturers of the Earth (Philippines)
Nestlé	Japan: Nestlé violates labor laws, disregards labor unions, has insufficient redundancy programs when production facilities are closed and refuses to provide information to the public.	Nestle Japan Labour Union (Japan)
Nestlé	Bangladesh/Philippines/India: unfair advertising for baby formula, violation of the „International Code of Marketing of Breast Milk“.	Baby Milk Action (UK)
Syngenta	Indonesia: Nestlé markets paraquat, a dangerous herbicide, is a member of the WWF-Round Table for Sustainable Palm Oil, and claims that paraquat is compatible with a benign and humane agriculture.	Rettet den Regenwald (Germany) [Save the Rainforest]

## Public Eye POSITIVE Award

Baer Weichkäserei (Switzerland) [makers of soft cheese]	Switzerland: Baer is actively involved in campaigns to keep foods free of genetically altered ingredients. For every cheese sold 1 cent goes to the BAER-Foundation, which promotes projects toward a Swiss agriculture free of GMOs.	Kleinbauern-Vereinigung (Switzerland) [Small Farmers Association]
CARE Naturkost (Germany) [natural foods]	Germany/Brazil/Colombia, etc.: imports and exports raw materials from controlled organic/biological cultivation. 7 years ago CARE pioneered the biological production of palm oil. Today, CARE's position as a trader is put in jeopardy by the ‚agro-fuel-delusion‘.	Rettet den Regenwald , e.V. (Germany) [Save the Rainforest]
Hess Natur (Germany)	Burkina Faso: this company offers growers of cotton from controlled biological cultivation a purchase guarantee at a fair price. They are also pioneers in ecological textiles and the promotion of social benefits for producers.	Helvetas (Switzerland)

Marks and Spencer (UK)	United Kingdom: is leading a campaign („Plan A – there is no Plan B“) for sustainable development: the company addresses climate change, waste, diminished resources and is committed to fair terms of trade, fair working conditions and keeping workers healthy.	Daniel Wimberley, Jersey Cycling Tours (UK)
Soglio (Switzerland)	Switzerland: Soglio produces and sells care products that contain raw materials from the Swiss mountains. The company works closely with a number of biological farmers in the Alps and promotes a sustainable development for the Alpine region.	Gebana AG (Switzerland)
Swisscom (Switzerland)	Switzerland/worldwide: As part of the Solidarcom Campaign Swisscom repairs used mobile phones and sells them cheaply in poor countries. The money from the phone sales goes to support children and youth projects of Terre des Hommes.	Terre des Hommes (Switzerland)

**A Project of Berne Declaration (Coordination) and Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth Switzerland**

**The Public Eye Awards c/o Erklärung von Bern, PO Box, CH-8026 Zürich  
Phone + 41 (0)44 277 70 06, Fax + 41 (0)44 277 70 01, [www.publiceye.ch](http://www.publiceye.ch)**